

### **REMARKS**

Claims 67-70, 72-80, 82-85, 87,95, 97-100, 102-110, 112-115, 117-125 and 127-130 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 67, 68, 70, 72-80, 82, 83, 85, 88-95, 97, 98, 100, 102-110, 112, 113, 115, 112-125, and 127-130 are amended and claims 71, 81, 86, 96, 101, 11, 116, and 126 are canceled. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to the Applicant Mr. Urbanski and the Applicant's representative by Examiner Champagne during the June 30, 2010 personal interview. The points discussed are incorporated into the above amendments and following remarks.

Applicants have significantly amended the claims by suggestions from the Office Action, the June 30 interview, and/or support from Applicants' specification, at least for example, on pages 5, line 15-page 6, line 18 and page 16 and page 10, line 1-page 11, lines 14. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative for any questions regarding specification support for the claimed subject matter.

### **Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action rejects claims 67-130 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action identifies four terms as "new matter."

During the June 30 personal interview, Examiner Champagne agreed that the above amendments obviate the rejections. Specifically, Applicants assert:

(A) With respect to the term “information unresponsive to said information request,”

Applicants delete “unresponsive to said information request” in the claims to obviate this rejection.

(B) With respect to the term “third party,” Applicants amend the claims to change “third party” to “the advertiser” to obviate this rejection.

(C) With respect to the term “a second information site,” Applicants amend the claims to change “a second information site,” to “the advertiser’s information site” to obviate this rejection.

(D) With respect to the term “determines/determining a geographic region for relevant information/said information request,” Applicants amend the claims to now recite “determines/determining a particular geographic area for relevant information.”

During the June 30 personal interview, Examiner Champagne specifically indicated that Applicant overcame the rejection and discussed the many different ways the a geographic region for relevant information can be determined, such as for example, on pages 5, line 28-page 6, line 18 and page 10, line 1-page 11, lines 14.

Accordingly, in view of the amendments and remarks above, Applicants request that the rejections of claims 67-130 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

### **Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action rejects independent claims 67-130 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Office Action identifies four terms as “new matter.”

During the June 30 personal interview, Examiner Champagne agreed that the above amendments obviate the rejections. Specifically, Applicants assert:

(A) With respect to the term “information unresponsive to said information request,”

Applicants delete “unresponsive to said information request” in the claims to obviate this rejection

(B) With respect to the term “third party,” Applicants amend the claims to change

“third party” to “the advertiser” to obviate this rejection.

(C) With respect to the term “said network,” Applicants amend the claim 82 to

obviate this rejection.

(D) With respect to the term “determines information at said first information site,”

Applicants cancel claims 71, 86, 101 and 116 to obviate this rejection.

(E) With respect to the term “said geographic location...and said geographic

information,” Applicants amend the claims 73, 88, 103 and 118 as suggested by the Office Action to obviate this rejection.

(F) With respect to the term “a site having a contextual relationship to information

requested,” Applicants cancel claims 81, 96, 111 and 126 to obviate this rejection.

(G) With respect to the term “determines/determining a geographic region for relevant

information/said information request,” Applicants amend the claims to now recite “determines/determining a particular geographic area for relevant information.”

During the June 30 personal interview, Examiner Champagne specifically indicated that Applicant overcame the rejection and discussed the many different ways the a geographic region for relevant information can be determined, such as

for example, on pages 5, line 28-page 6, line 18 and page 10, line 1-page 11, lines 14.

Accordingly, in view of the amendments and remarks above, Applicants request that the rejections of claims 67-130 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims 67-130 Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office Action rejects claims 67-130 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Riedman (1998 article in Advertising Age).

Applicants assert that Riedman does not disclose or suggest at least “program code that determines a particular geographic area for relevant information to be provided in answering said information request, wherein the particular geographic area for relevant information is determined from at least one of the communication device’s derived geographic location, the communication device’s location stored in memory, the communication device’s network address, said information request, said subject matter of interest, and an input to the communication device, the input to the communication device being at least one of a selection on a displayed map, input of a postal code, and input of address information,” and “program code to retrieve answer information from one or more databases, said answer information comprising information responsive to said information request and advertiser information, said advertiser information being based on the determined particular geographic area for relevant information and containing a link to connect said communication device to the advertiser’s information site relating to said particular subject matter,” as recited in independent claim 67, and similarly recited in independent claims 79, 82, 94, 97, 109, 112, 124 and 126-130.

Riedman discloses an article about GoTo.com which is an auction model that will let advertisers bid for the highest placement in keyword results in searches. The article mentions “that having listed prices was the only way to conduct stock market-styled bidding.” Furthermore, the only advertisers mentioned were national or international advertisers such as Isuzu, Mining Co., Shopping.com, eToys and Wedding Channel. *See e.g.*, Riedman article pages 1 and 2. This is not Applicants’ claimed invention.

Applicants’ claimed invention concerns providing answer information at a first information site in response to a request that comprises information responsive to the information request and advertiser information, the “advertiser information being based on the determined particular geographic area for relevant information and containing a link to connect said communication device to the advertiser’s information site relating to said particular subject matter,” where “the particular geographic area for relevant information is determined from at least one of the communication device’s derived geographic location, the communication device’s location stored in memory, the communication device’s network address, said information request, said subject matter of interest, and an input to the communication device, the input to the communication device being at least one of a selection on a displayed map, input of a postal code, and input of address information,” as in Applicants’ claimed invention. None of the above is in Riedman.

During the June 30 personal interview, the Examiner indicated that Applicants’ proposed amended claim 67 would overcome DeLorme et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040). In particular, the Examiner agreed that DeLorme does not contain “said answer information comprising information responsive to said information request and advertiser information, said advertiser information being based on the determined particular geographic area for relevant information

and containing a link to connect said communication device to the advertiser's information site relating to said particular subject matter," as recited in Applicants' claimed invention.

In addition, Applicants' do not believe that DeLorme discloses or suggests "program code that determines a particular geographic area for relevant information to be provided in answering said information request, wherein the particular geographic area for relevant information is determined from at least one of the communication device's derived geographic location, the communication device's location stored in memory, the communication device's network address, said information request, said subject matter of interest, and an input to the communication device, the input to the communication device being at least one of a selection on a displayed map, input of a postal code, and input of address information," as recited in Applicants' claimed invention.

Thus, independent claims 67, 79, 82, 94, 97, 109, 112, 124 and 126-130 define patentable subject matter. Claims 68-78, 80, 83-93, 95, 96, 98-108, 110, 111, 113-123 and 125 depend from independent claims 67, 79, 82, 94, 97, 109, 112, 124 and 126-130 and therefore, also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Having addressed all rejections and objections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If necessary, the Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge or credit the **Prass LLP**

**Deposit Account No. 50-4082** for any deficiency or overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 8, 2010

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 67413

*Prass LLP*

By: /Ronald E. Prass, Jr./

Ronald E. Prass, Jr.

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 42,089

Telephone No.: (443) 569-0770

Facsimile No.: (443) 458-0958